DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 316 763 CE 054 585

AUTHOR	Figueroa, Jose R.; Silvanik, Robert A.
TITLE	The Provision of Education and Other Services in State Welfare-to-Work Programs. State Policy Reports. Training and Employment.
INSTITUTION	National Governors' Association, Washington, DC. Center for Policy Research.
SPONS AGENCY	Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.; Mott (C.S.) Foundation, Flint, Mich.
REPORT NO	ISBN-1-55877-068-2
PUB DATE	89
NOTE	48p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Governors' Association, 444 North Capitol Street, Washington, DC 20001-1572.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Adolescents; Adults; *Compliance (Legal); Economically Disadvantaged; Educational Needs; Eligibility; *Federal Legislation; State Federal Aid; *State Programs; *Welfare Recipients; *Welfare Services; *Work Experience Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*Job Opportunities Basic Skills Training Program

ABSTRACT

The first phase of a study of state welfare-to work programs in 1988 consisted of a survey mailed to the states. Results provide practical information on the operational experience of state welfare-to-work programs, and at the national level, enhance both policy development and implementation activities, especially in conjunction with the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training Program (JOBS). The study showed that state efforts to promote economic self-sufficiency among welfare recipients have provided both the basis for welfare reform and a valuable lesson on program implementation. The study also revealed that much more needs to be done, particularly in meeting new federal participation requirements and in improving data tracking systems for state and national monitoring and evaluation. Additionally, the study found that most states have created networks involving agencies other than the state welfare agency to provide services to welfare-to-work participants. It also found that most welfare recipients are in need of educational services. Most states have not targeted services to specific groups beyond those required to participate in the welfare-to-work program. The study concluded that many states will have to expand the services included in their welfare-to-work programs to meet the JOBS service requirements, and some states will have to increase substantially the amount of state dollars allocated to the program. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

THE PROVISION OF EDUCATION AND OTHER SERVICES IN STATE WELFARE-TO-WORK PROGRAMS

NATIONAL GOVERNORS' ASSOCIATION

State Policy Reports

Training and Employment

ED316763

by Jose R. Figueroa and Robert A. Silvanik

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R Y Bond

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Training and Employment Program
Center for Policy Research

National Governors' Association

CE054585

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The National Governors' Association, founded in 1908 as the National Governors' Conference, is the instrument through which the nation's Governors collectively influence the development and implementation of national policy and apply creative leadership to state issues. The association's members are the Governors of the fifty states, the commonwealths of the Northern Mariana Islands and Puerto Rico, and the territories of American Samoa, Guam, and the Virgin Islands. The association has seven standing committees on major issues: Agriculture and Rural Development; Economic Development and Technological Innovation; Energy and Environment; Human Resources; International Trade and Foreign Relations; Justice and Public Safety; and Transportation, Commerce, and Communications. Subcommittees and task forces that focus on principal concerns of the Governors operate within this framework.

The association works closely with the administration and Congress on state-federal policy issues through its offices in the Hall of the States in Washington, D.C. The association serves as a vehicle for sharing knowledge of innovative programs among the states and provides technical assistance and consultant services to Governors on a wide range of management and policy issues.

The Center for Policy Research is the research and development arm of NGA. The center is a vehicle for sharing knowledge about innovative state activities, exploring the impact of federal initiatives on state government, and providing technical assistance to states. The center works in a number of policy fields, including agriculture, economic development, education, environment, health, social services, training and employment, trade, and transportation.

ISBN 1-55877-068-2

© 1989 by the National Governors' Association
444 North Capitol Street
Washington, D.C. 20001-1572

This research study is being funded with grants from the Charles Stewart Mott and Ford Foundations. The opinions expressed in this report are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official positions of the sponsors.

Printed in the United States of America.

Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	v
INTRODUCTION	1
Historical Background	1
The JOBS Program	3
NGA SURVEY RESULTS	5
Limitations of the Data	5
Participation Requirements	7
Targeting	8
Client Flow and Assessment	11
Service Mix	14
Educational Activities	14
Employment and Training Activities	21
Service Delivery Networks	25
Program Financing	28
Program Outcomes and Evaluation	28
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	33
Appendix	37

TABLES

Table 1	Distribution of Voluntary and Mandatory Programs by State	9
Table 2	Welfare-to-Work Program Target Groups by State	10
Table 3	Distribution of Client Flow Models	12
Table 4	Nonwelfare Agencies Conducting Assessments	13
Table 5	States Testing the Educational Skills of Program Participants	15
Table 6	Participation Rate by Type of Activity	16
Table 7	Percent of AFDC Population Who Have Not Completed High School by State	17
Table 8	Participation Levels and Rates in State Educational Program Components	18
Table 9	Primary Providers of Educational Activities in State Welfare-to-Work Programs	20
Table 10	States Subsidizing Child Care Assistance for Welfare-to-Work Participants	24
Table 11	States Providing Extended/Transitional Child Care to Recipients After Placement	25
Table 12	States Providing Extended Health Care Coverage to Program Participants	26
Table 13	Main Service Providers by Type of Activity	27
Table 14	Welfare-to-Work Program Funding Sources by State	29
Table 15	Performance Measures by State	31
Table 16	Welfare-to-Work Program Evaluations by State	32

Executive Summary

For centuries, policymakers have searched for an acceptable balance between the objectives of social equity and the demands for individual responsibility. The scope and emphasis of programs to help the poor have evolved over time as economic and social circumstances have changed. At times, assistance to the able-bodied poor has been tied to some type of work requirement.

Federal involvement in employment programs for welfare recipients has evolved over the years culminating with the passage of landmark legislation last year. In the early 1980s, states were given greater flexibility to tailor their federally assisted welfare-to-work programs to better meet their own unique circumstances and to expand the services provided to their clients. States experimented with different welfare-to-work programs and demonstrated that these programs could have a positive effect on helping welfare recipients become self-sufficient. In 1988, with support from the Governors, Congress passed the Family Support Act (FSA). Existing state welfare-to-work programs formed the basis for the major component of the new welfare reform act, the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training Program (JOBS).

Sponsored by the Charles Stewart Mott and Ford Foundations, the National Governors' Association Center for Policy Research undertook a research project to examine state welfare-to-work programs. This is the report for the first phase of the study. This report is based on a survey mailed to the states last winter and examines state fiscal 1988 welfare-to-work programs. The second phase of the study consisted of case studies of four states: New York, Rhode Island, South Carolina, and Washington. A report on this phase will be issued by fall 1989. The third phase of the study will consist of a survey to determine how far states have moved from their fiscal 1988 welfare-to-work programs toward JOBS. The entire research project will be completed by spring 1990.

Results of the first phase of the study provide practical information on the operational experience of state welfare-to-work programs and, at the national level, enhance both policy development and implementation activities. States in the planning and early implementation stages of their JOBS program may find the study results most helpful. The study reveals that state efforts to promote economic self-sufficiency among welfare recipients have provided both the basis for welfare reform and a valuable lesson on program implementation. The study also reveals that much more needs to be done, particularly in meeting new federal participation requirements and in improving data tracking systems for state and national monitoring and evaluation. Some states will require more changes than others and will benefit the most from training and technical assistance.

Following are some of the major conclusions and findings:

- Each state has created service delivery networks involving agencies other than the state welfare agency to provide services to welfare-to-work participants. Services offered to program participants are provided under different arrangements by different agencies in different states.
- Available educational data suggest that most AFDC recipients are in need of educational services. For those states that were able to provide information, the percentage of the adult AFDC population that had not completed high school averaged 51 percent, ranging from 25 to 66 percent.
- A large number of state welfare agencies were not able to provide information regarding participation in different program components or the total amount of funds expended by program activity, although other state agencies had the information. This was particularly true for educational activities where the majority of the states were able to provide information on participation in educational services only on an aggregate basis.
- While thirteen states have established target groups for welfare-to-work services, most state programs have not targeted services on specific groups beyond those required to participate.
- All states responding to the NGA survey reported assessment mechanisms in place. The majority of the states reported a two or more tiered assessment process where the initial assessment is conducted by the welfare agency and based on this assessment the individual is referred to other agencies that usually conduct a more indepth assessment. During fiscal 1988, approximately 80 percent of the states assessed welfare-to-work program participants for literacy and basic skills.
- There is a tremendous variation in how state welfare-to-work programs have been financed and in the amount of state resources allocated to the programs.
- Because of the different existing arrangements among state agencies for provision and payment of services a comparison of costs per participant in state welfare-to-work programs is not accurate. Depending on the type of arrangements among agencies, there is a possibility that the same intensity of services is being offered in two states with markedly different costs per participant.

JOBS Implications

- Many states will have to expand the services included in their welfare-to-work programs to meet the JOBS service requirements. In fiscal 1988, twenty-four states had all four services (educational activities, job skills training, job readiness activities, and job development and placement) required under the JOBS program. Twenty-nine met the requirement of two out of four employment and training services (job search, on-the-job training, work supplementation, and community work experience).

Twenty-two state welfare-to-work programs met both JOBS service requirements.

- States planning their JOBS program will need to pay attention to the educational needs of the participants, the intensity and length of time needed for these services, and their effect on client flow.
- The state program participant tracking systems will, for the most part, need to be improved to meet information requirements under JOBS. In many circumstances welfare-to-work data are incompatible across states and cannot be aggregated at the national level.
- Because most welfare-to-work programs have not targeted services on specific groups and under JOBS full federal matching is dependent upon states expending at least 55 percent of allotted funds on the three identified target groups, states will have to look carefully at the issue of targeting.
- Inconsistencies across states on data items and the lack of uniform definitions and data gathering periods will make it difficult to develop performance standards for the JOBS program by 1993. In order to be able to develop JOBS performance standards, states should be prepared to work cooperatively with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services to develop a national data collection system with common definitions.
- In many states, meeting JOBS participation quotas will require an increase in the number of program participants.
- The financial data available suggest that some states will have to substantially increase the amount of state dollars allocated to the JOBS program in order to take advantage of full federal matching funds.

1. Introduction

During the decade of the 1980s, states were given greater flexibility to tailor their federally assisted welfare-to-work programs to better meet their own unique circumstances and to expand the services provided to their clients. This opportunity was initiated in 1981 with the passage by Congress of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act, which permitted states to establish Work Incentive (WIN) Demonstration programs in place of the standardized federal WIN program. With this new freedom, and prompted by documented evidence that many welfare recipients had not completed high school and that some program participants lacked the basic skills necessary to successfully complete a training program, remedial and adult education became an increasingly important service component in a number of state programs.

This experimentation in the states was an important factor in the development of the federal Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training (JOBS) Program, Title II of the Family Support Act of 1988. State programs demonstrated the need and the potential for providing educational services to welfare recipients, and helped build a consensus for a comprehensive welfare reform initiative. As a result, for the first time the JOBS program mandates an educational component in welfare-to-work programs, in addition to provisions for employment and training services, child support enforcement and child care, and transitional support services.

To help states prepare to implement JOBS program provisions, and in particular to provide educational services to participants, the National Governors' Association set out to examine the characteristics of and services provided by the existing welfare-to-work programs in the states. This report presents the findings from a fifty-state survey designed to collect information on current welfare-to-work initiatives and the relationship of these initiatives to JOBS program requirements . In addition, the report highlights the implications of these findings relative to the actions required for states to implement the JOBS program by October 1, 1990. A brief historical overview of welfare policy in the United States and a short section outlining the JOBS program provide a context for the survey results and conclusions.

Historical Background

For centuries policymakers have looked for an acceptable balance between the objectives of social equity and the demands for individual responsibility. As economic and social circumstances and public perceptions have changed over time, so have the scope and emphasis of programs to help the poor. For the able-bodied poor, however, assistance in cash or in kind has often been tied to some type of work requirement.

Since the 1930s, the federal-state-local welfare system has become increasingly complex. Over the years, states have experimented with new welfare-to-work programs that have creatively combined funding and services from a variety of federal, state, and local sources. During this period of experimentation, federal interest in establishing strong work components in federal welfare programs has increased. For instance, a mandatory employment and training program for food stamp recipients went into effect in April 1987. Further, the new Family Support Act of 1988 requires states to establish welfare-to-work programs as a condition for participation in the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program.

Federal involvement in employment programs for welfare recipients has evolved over the years. In the early 1960s, states were encouraged to implement programs providing employment, training, and supportive services to employable AFDC recipients. Since 1967, the WIN program has required states to both provide employment and training services to some AFDC recipients and to enforce a work requirement. The WIN program was designed to provide skill assessments, job training, and job placement services for AFDC recipients to help them become self-sufficient. Limitations on federal funds, however, restricted the states' ability to provide employment-related services to all WIN registrants. AFDC recipients who are selected for participation in WIN must accept available jobs, training, or other related services needed to prepare them for employment or be subject to a penalty that varies by family composition. Since its inception, the WIN program has been jointly administered at the federal level by the Department of Labor and the Department of Health and Human Services. Dual administrative responsibility also has been required at the state level.

The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act (OBRA) of 1981 gave states the option to operate WIN demonstration projects that provide greater flexibility than the regular WIN program to design and administer work-related programs for AFDC applicants and recipients. These demonstration projects allowed states to design an alternative to WIN, administered by a single agency. States were allowed to request waivers in order to develop a program that maximized their available resources, and recognized their labor market conditions.

Under the Community Work Experience (CWEP) provisions of OBRA, states were given an option to require AFDC recipients to work in public or nonprofit organizations in exchange for their welfare benefits. Although federal regulations allow states to include job search and other activities under CWEP, the primary activity is workfare, whereby clients are required to work in unpaid public service jobs in exchange for their AFDC grant. In addition, the act authorized states to fund on-the-job training programs by diverting recipients' welfare grants for use as wage subsidies for private employers. Generally known as "work supplementation" and "grant diversion" programs, they typically use AFDC benefits to subsidize wages for AFDC recipients in private and nonprofit jobs for up to nine months.

Another employment-related program for AFDC recipients is the Job Search program authorized under Title IV-A of the Social Security Act. The 1982 Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act (TEFRA) authorized a special Job Search program for AFDC recipients. The act permits states to require the participation of AFDC applicants and recipients in an employment search program beginning at the time of

application. Applicants may be required to participate in the search program for eight weeks.

Using the flexibility built into these federal programs, states created their own unique welfare-to-work programs and demonstrated that these programs could have a positive effect on helping welfare recipients become self-sufficient. In the process of planning and implementing their programs, states discovered that education can play a significant role in determining client success. In addition, states realized that federal funding was not adequate to finance all the activities necessary for a successful program. These issues were addressed by the Family Support Act of 1988, which requires states to operate comprehensive welfare-to-work programs and increases federal funds available for these activities.

The JOBS Program

In February of 1987, the Governors adopted a policy position on welfare reform that emphasized the removal of existing barriers to self-sufficiency for welfare recipients. They called for changes that would require those receiving AFDC to participate in education, training, or placement activities. In 1988, with support from the Governors, Congress passed the Family Support Act (FSA). Existing state programs formed the basis for the major component of the new welfare reform act, the JOBS program.

The JOBS program is the national education, training, and employment program designed to provide services to welfare clients to enable them to become self-sufficient, economically independent citizens. It requires that states provide educational and employment and training services to targeted clients, guarantee child care to JOBS participants, conduct assessment and orientation, meet participation quotas, and make provisions for sanctioning clients. The effective date for JOBS is October 1, 1990. By October 1, 1992, states are required, where feasible, to make the program available in each political subdivision of the state taking into account the number of prospective participants, the local economy, and other relevant factors.

The JOBS program is designed to encourage states to focus services on three primary target groups:

- Custodial parents under twenty-four years of age who have no high school diploma, are not enrolled in a high school or equivalency preparation program, or have been out of work for the last year;
- Adult recipients whose youngest child is within two years of ineligibility; and
- Adults in families receiving AFDC in thirty-six of the prior sixty months.

Although the states may serve other groups as well, the legislation stipulates that the federal funding match for that state's program would be reduced if less than 55 percent of the funds in a state are spent on the federal target groups. States are given some flexibility to operate a "volunteers first" program, as long as the state ensures that 55 percent of their resources are allocated to the target groups and federal participation quotas are met.

2. NGA Survey Results

In October 1988, the National Governors' Association Center for Policy Research undertook an eighteen-month policy research project funded by the Charles Stewart Mott and Ford Foundations. The purpose of this project was to examine existing state welfare-to-work programs across the country, with emphasis on their educational components.

The study was divided into three phases. The first phase of the study consisted of a mail survey to the states to capture information on their existing welfare-to-work programs. Survey responses were gathered between November 1988 and April 1989. The second phase consisted of site visits to four states: New York, Rhode Island, South Carolina, and Washington. These states were selected to reflect a variety of program components, stages of implementation, state funding levels, and AFDC benefits. Site visits were conducted between May and July 1989 and a report on the case studies will be issued by fall 1989. The third phase of the study will consist of a survey to determine state progress in restructuring their current welfare-to-work programs to meet JOBS requirements. This survey will be mailed out to the states in the fall of 1989, and a report will be published in the spring of 1990. The report will document the changes made by the states in their welfare-to-work programs.

The report on the first phase of the study is based on responses from a survey mailed to the fifty states and the District of Columbia. Forty-two states and the District of Columbia responded to the survey (see Appendix A for a complete list of respondent states). Of the forty-three respondents, forty-one reported welfare-to-work initiatives in place during fiscal 1988. The survey was designed to collect information about all services provided. However, it takes a more detailed look at the educational components of state welfare-to-work programs to determine the extent to which such services were being provided, the number of individuals participating in them, and the institutional arrangements existing among agencies and providers to offer those educational services. This report reflects the state welfare-to-work programs as of fiscal 1988 (October 1, 1987 to September 30, 1988).

Limitations of the Data

It must be noted that there are limitations in the data obtained from the survey for some program areas. For this reason, caution must be excercised when comparing the state data presented in this report. Many of the states were unable to provide all of the information in the survey. In some instances, even though the information requested was provided, it was not possible to make comparisons across the states because of differences among states in definitions, reporting periods, and data gather-

ing methods. Further, a large number of states were able to provide information on educational services only on an aggregate basis, not by different educational activities. In general, data limitations are related to participation rates in the programs and in specific program activities, information sharing for referrals to other agencies, and funding levels for both programs and activities.

There is considerable variation among states about how data terms are defined, how data are reported, and how program outcomes are measured. Program participation, for example, is defined differently in different states. In some instances, registration is included as participation while in others an individual must be receiving a work-related service to be considered a participant. In addition, some states maintain duplicated data only while others are able to provide unduplicated data. Duplication may occur under different circumstances. For example, duplication occurs when a welfare recipient participates in more than one program component during the period of time used for reporting purposes. The duplication issue is complicated by the fact that some states compile data monthly, others annually.

Data on participation rates by program activity are also limited. For the most part, states were not able to provide the number of individuals participating in the specific program activities. In general, state welfare agencies were not able to report the total amount of funds expended by program activity because at least some of the costs for services to welfare-to-work participants are provided out of direct appropriations to other agencies or service providers. Some states reported that although the participation and cost information was not available at the welfare agency, it was maintained by those agencies or organizations providing the services. This suggests that information sharing is somewhat limited for those welfare recipients referred to other agencies for services.

Limitations of available data also make it difficult, if not impossible, to gain a true picture of the cost structure of the programs. The total program cost must reflect the types of services offered and the specific funding agencies. There is considerable variability in how different services are financed. In some instances, states enter into nonfinancial agreements with other agencies for provision of services while in others the welfare agency pays for the services. In the former, the welfare-to-work program budget does not capture the cost of these services. In the latter case, the costs are included in the welfare-to-work budget.

Because of the different existing arrangements among state agencies for provision and payment of services, it is also not possible to make interstate comparisons with respect to costs per participant. A low cost per participant does not necessarily mean that intensive services are not being offered to the welfare recipients. Depending on the type of arrangements among agencies, there is a possibility that the same intensity of services is being offered in a state with a low cost per participant as in a state with a high cost per participant. A reliable state cost per participant comparison would need to capture the different arrangements among each state and their local agencies. At this time, given the data available, this comparison is not possible.

Not only did data limitations make analysis of parts of the survey difficult, but also it raises questions on how the states are going to comply with the complex

reporting requirements under JOBS. These limitations in the data suggest that states will have to upgrade their data systems to comply with the JOBS data collection and reporting requirements. These tracking and monitoring systems, unfortunately, take time and resources to develop, install, test, perfect, and fully implement.

Participation Requirements

Within the options available, different participation requirements have been established to reflect fiscal and institutional constraints and political realities within the states. Some programs have been mandatory while others have been voluntary. Further, some states require specific categories of individuals—for example, AFDC recipients with no high school diploma—to participate in specific activities. In reality, the concept of voluntary participation is ambiguous and in many instances the difference between voluntary and mandatory is tenuous. For example, some mandatory programs require clients to register but not necessarily to participate. Alternatively, programs may be voluntary but aggressive recruiting might be in place, as in the case of Massachusetts. The concept of voluntary participation is further complicated when available resources are considered. Some states with mandatory programs allocate a small amount of resources to the welfare-to-work program while some states with voluntary programs allocate a large amount of funds relative to their total welfare population.

During fiscal 1988, virtually all states used WIN eligibility criteria to determine exemptions. These criteria are:

- A parent (or caretaker) whose youngest child is under six years of age;
- A child under age sixteen;
- An individual working thirty hours or more per week in unsubsidized employment;
- An individual who has a medically determined temporary illness or injury;
- A woman who is in the last four months of her pregnancy;
- An individual age sixty-five or more; and
- An individual whose presence is required in the home to care for another member of the household who has been medically determined to be precluded from self-care and for whom alternate care arrangements are not feasible.

A few states, however, have obtained waivers to require participation for specific groups who would otherwise be exempted. For example, Arkansas uses a waiver that adds adult caretakers of children between the ages of three and six to those required to participate in the welfare-to-work program. Florida requires participation by teenage parents with children age one or more.

Of the states responding to the NGA survey, approximately three-fourths had mandatory programs and one-fourth had voluntary programs. Iowa and New Jersey reported a mix of voluntary and mandatory programs. In these states, the decision about the voluntary or mandatory nature of the welfare-to-work program rests at the

county or local level. Table 1 demonstrates how the states have structured their welfare-to-work programs regarding mandatory versus voluntary programs.

All states with mandatory programs reported that AFDC recipients who may be exempt from mandatory participation, but volunteer to participate, are permitted to take part in the program. Of these states, however, only Kansas, Maryland, Montana, Pennsylvania, and Washington give priority to those AFDC recipients who are "exempt voluntaries."

Targeting

Among those welfare recipients required to participate, most states have not given priority to particular groups for services in their welfare-to-work program. Thirteen states, however, have established specific target groups. These groups include long-term AFDC recipients, AFDC recipients who have not completed high school, teenage parents, AFDC recipients between the ages of eighteen and twenty-three, and first-time AFDC recipients. Priority groups for the thirteen states that reported targeting specific groups are listed in Table 2.

Although some of these priority groups are similar to the target groups under the JOBS program, there are some variations. For example, two states reported long-term recipients as a target group. Their definitions, however, are different from those under the JOBS program in terms of the length of time on the welfare rolls. For instance, in Maryland long-term recipient is defined as receiving assistance for twenty-four of the preceding thirty-six months, while the JOBS program requires those on the AFDC rolls thirty-six of the last sixty months to participate. Only one state, Missouri, reported custodial parents without a high school diploma as a target group. Here too, however, definitions are different regarding age: Missouri's program targets custodial parents under age twenty-one while JOBS targets custodial parents under age twenty-four.

The issue of targeting is further complicated by state policies regarding exemptions and deferrals, and their enforcement. In general, higher participation rates can be expected with a mandatory participation requirement in which deferrals are limited and granted for short periods of time, and enforcement procedures are triggered quickly.

Sanctions are applied to those individuals who do not participate in or cooperate with the mandatory program. In general terms, sanctions are a reduction of a client's grant for a specified period of time. Traditionally, however, sanction rates have been very low, even in strictly mandatory programs. According to a 1981 report from the Division of Program Planning and Review, Office of WIN, the percentage of WIN registrants sanctioned nationwide over the years was less than 2 percent. Although the NGA survey was not designed to capture the level of sanctioning among states, some states volunteered this information. For those states, sanction rates ranged from 1 percent to approximately 7 percent during fiscal 1988. Most states do not sanction volunteers, though some states (like South Carolina) do.

Table 1
Distribution of Voluntary and Mandatory Programs by State (Fiscal 1988)

State	*Mandatory*	*Voluntary*	*Mix (some local programs mandatory, some voluntary)*
Alabama	■		
Alaska	■		
Arizona	■		
Arkansas	■		
California	■		
Connecticut		■	
Delaware	■		
District of Columbia		■	
Florida	■		
Georgia		■	
Hawaii		■	
Idaho	■		
Illinois	■		
Indiana		■	
Iowa			■
Kansas	■		
Kentucky		■	
Maryland		■	
Massachusetts		■	
Michigan	■		
Minnesota	■		
Missouri	■		
Montana	■		
Nevada	■		
New Jersey			■*
New Mexico	■		
New York	■		
North Dakota	■		
Ohio	■		
Oklahoma	■		
Oregon	■		
Pennsylvania	■		
Rhode Island	■		
South Carolina	■		
South Dakota	■		
Tennessee		■	
Vermont	■		
Virginia		■	
Washington	■		
West Virginia	■		
Wisconsin	■		

*Mandatory in all counties except one.

SOURCE: National Governors' Association Survey of State Welfare-to-Work Programs, 1989.

Table 2
Welfare-to-Work Program Target Groups by State (Fiscal 1988)

State	*Priority Group(s)*
Arizona	■ AFDC recipients who have not completed high school ■ Teen parents
Connecticut	■ Participants functioning below the 8th grade ■ Two-parent family (unemployed parents) ■ Limited English speaking ■ Teen parents ■ Long-term welfare recipients (receiving assistance for five or more years)
Kansas	■ Principal wage earners in two-parent AFDC families ■ Volunteers ■ Teenage and single parents ■ General Assistance (GA) designated principal wage earner
Kentucky	■ Job-ready individuals
Maryland	■ Long-term recipients (receiving assistance for 24 of preceding 36 months) ■ Parents age 21 and under who have not completed high school or equivalent ■ First-time applicants who are not job ready ■ Volunteers
Minnesota	■ Caretakers under age 21 ■ Caretakers without high school diploma or equivalent ■ Caretakers who have been on AFDC at least 24 of the preceding 36 months
Missouri	■ Custodial parents under age 24 who have not completed high school and have limited experience in the workforce ■ Long-term welfare recipients (receiving assistance for any 36 of the preceding 60 months) ■ Recipients who have not completed high school
New Jersey	■ First-time recipients of AFDC
Oklahoma	■ Recipients between the ages of 18 and 23 ■ Recipients receiving assistance for 24 consecutive months
Pennsylvania	■ Recipients receiving assistance for 24 or more months ■ Recipients with reading level below the 6th grade ■ Recipients with limited fluency in English
Rhode Island	■ Two-parent family (unemployed parents) ■ School dropouts between the ages of 16 and 18
Vermont	■ Recipients whose youngest child is between the ages of 12 and 18 and who have received assistance for fewer than 13 months ■ Recipients whose youngest child is between the ages of 6 and 11 and who have received assistance for fewer than 15 months
Wisconsin	■ Head of household age 21 and younger ■ Recipients with characteristics associated with long-term receipt of AFDC (never held a paying job, never married, no high school diploma or GED, more than two children) ■ Long-term recipients

SOURCE: National Governors' Association Survey of State Welfare-to-Work Programs, 1989.

Client Flow and Assessment

Essentially, there are two models of client flow: sequential and assessment-based. Nineteen states mandate that certain components be provided at particular points in the process or use particular sequence(s) of service components that participants are required to follow. On the other hand, twenty-one states reported the use of assessment-based models where the assessment of clients' needs, interests, aptitudes, and barriers to employment is used to assign individuals to different services. Table 3 presents the client flow models used by the states.

Under the JOBS program, states are required to assess the educational, child care, and other support service needs of every nonexempt family member or voluntary participant in the program. From this assessment, an employability plan should be developed for each participant that sets forth the activities in which he or she will participate. States may require each participant to negotiate and sign a contract that specifies the individual's and the state's obligations and may also assign a case manager to the participant or family to review the employability plan, to assist in obtaining needed services, and to monitor participant progress.

Although all the respondent states reported an assessment mechanism in place, there are many variations among the states. An initial assessment is usually conducted by the welfare agency. In some instances, a more in-depth assessment is also conducted by another unit of the welfare agency. As a general rule, those individuals referred to other agencies for services are assessed further by those agencies to determine the type and intensity of services needed.

The majority of the respondent states reported a two or more tiered assessment process. Normally the initial assessment is conducted by the welfare agency. Based on information gathered in this assessment, the individual is referred to other agencies or service providers. The other agencies conduct a more in-depth assessment in their particular area of expertise after participants are referred to them. Thus, welfare-to-work participants may be assessed in many different areas depending on the number of agencies to which they are referred. In South Carolina, for instance, agencies other than the department of social services assess clients in the following areas: vocational, educational, psychological, social, medical, and economic.

In some states the assessment consists of checklists designed to identify deficiencies and problems in particular areas such as educational attainment, work history, health, and psychological stability. Twenty-two states reported the use of testing instruments in their initial assessment process. Of these states using tests during the initial assessment, ten states use the same test throughout the state. The other twelve leave the selection of the test to those at the county or local level. Many states use a combination of testing instruments and self-reported checklists.

Table 4 lists those agencies, other than welfare, providing assessment to welfare-to-work participants. The employment service agency assesses welfare-to-work participants in eleven states. In seven states, welfare clients are referred to Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) agencies for further assessment. In two states service providers conduct their own assessment. In seven states the decision on who conducts assessments is made at the county or local level.

Table 3
Distribution of Client Flow Models (Fiscal 1988)

State	*Set sequence of service components or certain components mandated at particular points in the process*	*Assessment determines services for all participants*
Alabama		■
Alaska	■	
Arizona	■	
Arkansas	■	
California	■	
Connecticut		■
Delaware		■
District of Columbia		■
Florida	■	
Georgia		■
Hawaii		■
Idaho		■
Illinois	■	
Indiana		■
Iowa		■
Kansas	■	
Kentucky		■
Maryland		■
Massachusetts		■
Michigan	■	
Minnesota	■	
Missouri	■	
Nevada	■	
New Hampshire	■	
New Jersey	■*	
New Mexico	■	
New York		■
North Dakota		■
Ohio	■	
Oklahoma		■
Oregon	■	
Pennsylvania		■
Rhode Island	■	
South Carolina		■
South Dakota		■
Tennessee		■
Vermont	■	
Virginia	■	
Washington		■
West Virginia		■
Wisconsin		■

*Each county determines specific sequence of services.

SOURCE: National Governors' Association Survey of State Welfare-to-Work Programs, 1989.

Table 4
Non-Welfare Agencies Conducting Assessments (Fiscal 1988)

State	*JTPA*	*Employment Service*	*Education Agency*[1]	*Contract Providers*	*Varies by County/Locality*
Alaska	■				
Arizona		■[2]			
Delaware				■	
Florida			■		
Hawaii		■			
Idaho		■[2]			
Illinois	■		■		
Kentucky		■[2]			
Maryland	■				
Massachusetts	■				
Minnesota					■
Missouri		■			
Montana		■[2]			
Nevada					■
New Hampshire		■			
New Mexico	■[2]	■			
New York					■
Ohio					■
Oregon					■
Rhode Island			■		
South Carolina	■	■	■	■	
South Dakota		■			
Tennessee		■			
Vermont	■[2]				
Virginia					■
Washington		■[2]			
Wisconsin					■

NOTES: 1 Includes local educational districts, vocational technical schools, community colleges, and other educational agencies.

2 State JTPA administrative agency is also the State Employment Security Agency.

SOURCE: National Governors' Association Survey of State Welfare-to-Work Programs, 1989.

Thirty-five states indicated that they assess the basic academic and literacy skills of participants. Eight of the states assess all program participants for these skills. The testing instrument used to assess the educational skills of program participants is, in most states, left to local discretion. Ten states report using a uniform testing instrument throughout the state. Of these states four test all welfare-to-work participants and the rest test some of the program participants. In those states with uniform tests throughout the state, the tests most often used are the Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System (CASAS), the General Aptitude Test Battery (GATB), and the Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE). Educational assessment information is summarized in Table 5.

Service Mix

Virtually all states have job search, educational, job skills training, job readiness, on-the-job training, and job development components in their welfare-to-work programs. A smaller number of states reported the use of grant diversion and community work experience. The following shows the number of states including each service in their welfare-to-work program:

	Type of Service	*Number of States*
■	Job Search	41
■	Job Skills Training	33
■	Education	32
■	Job Development	31
■	Job Readiness	26
■	On-the-Job Training	26
■	Community Work Experience	20
■	Grant Diversion	15

Participation rates in these different activities have varied among states. Table 6 presents participation rates for selected activities in those states that were able to provide this information. It should be noted again that because participation rates across states are not truly comparable this data should be used with caution. As indicated, some states maintain unduplicated data while others maintain only duplicated data.

EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES. Researchers have documented the strong relationship between welfare dependency and low levels of educational achievement. According to a study conducted by the Children's Defense Fund, three-fifths of all adults receiving AFDC assistance have not graduated from high school and at least one-fourth have no work experience. An Educational Testing Service study conducted in 1982 concluded that of those registered for work under the WIN program to receive AFDC 61 percent scored below the ninth grade level in math skills and 44 percent scored below that level in reading.

Yet, very few of the respondent states reported having information on the educational abilities of their welfare population. Only eight states had data on the percentage of their adult AFDC population who have not completed high school. Of those states, the percentage of the adult AFDC population that had not completed

Table 5
States Testing the Educational Skills of Program Participants (Fiscal 1988)

State	*Participants Tested*	*Uniform Test Statewide*
Alabama	Some	No
Arizona	Some	No
Arkansas	All	Yes - PUB-125 Client Assessment Packet
California	All	Yes - CASAS
Connecticut	Some	No
Delaware	Some	No
District of Columbia	Some	No
Florida	Some	No
Georgia	Some	-
Illinois	Some	No
Indiana	Some	No
Iowa	Some	No
Kentucky	Some	Yes - GATB, BOLT
Maryland	All	No
Massachusetts	All	No
Michigan	Some	No
Minnesota	Some	No
Missouri	Some	Yes - TABE
Montana	Some	No
Nevada	Some	No
New Hampshire	Some	Yes - Test Batteries
New Jersey	Some	No
New Mexico	Some	No
New York	Some	No
North Dakota	Some	Yes - GATB
Ohio	Some	No
Oregon	All	Yes - CASAS
Pennsylvania	Some	No
Rhode Island	Some	Yes - TABE
South Carolina	All	Yes - Slosson
Tennessee	All	No
Vermont	Some	Yes - CASAS
Virginia	Some	No
Washington	Some	No
Wisconsin	All	No

SOURCE: National Governors' Association Survey of State Welfare-to-Work Programs, 1989.

Table 6
Participation Rate by Type of Activity (Fiscal 1988)

Participation Rate Range (percent)	*OJT*	*Job Skills Training*	*Job Search*	*Educational Activities*	*Work Supplementation or Grant Diversion*	*Community Work Experience*
1-19	California, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Michigan, Montana, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Wisconsin	Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Connecticut, Georgia, Hawaii, Kentucky, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Wisconsin	Arkansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Montana, New York, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Virginia, Wisconsin	Arizona, Arkansas, Hawaii, Michigan, Nevada, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Wisconsin	California, Connecticut, Illinois, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Virginia, Wisconsin	Alaska, Arizona, California, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Massachusetts, New Mexico, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Virginia, Wisconsin
20-39	Connecticut, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina	Delaware, Idaho, Massachusetts, Michigan, Rhode Island	Arizona, Connecticut, Indiana, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island	Georgia, Indiana, Massachusetts, New Mexico		Idaho, Michigan
40-59		Pennsylvania	Georgia, Idaho, Nevada	California, Connecticut, Illinois, Rhode Island		Nevada
60-79			Delaware, Iowa, New Mexico, Tennessee	South Carolina, Virginia		
80-100			Alaska, South Carolina			

SOURCE: National Governors' Association Survey of State Welfare-to-Work Programs, 1989.

high school averaged 51 percent, ranging from 66 percent in Kentucky to 25 percent in Minnesota (See Table 7). In addition, two states were able to report the percentage of custodial parents under age twenty who did not have a high school diploma. These percentages were 89 percent in Vermont and 76 percent in Massachusetts.

Table 7
Percent of AFDC Population Who Have Not Completed High School by State
(Fiscal 1988)

State	*Percent Who Have Not Completed High School*
Alabama	(just started compiling data)
Illinois	60
Kentucky	66
Massachusetts	47
Minnesota	25
New Jersey	53
Oklahoma	46
Tennessee	63
Vermont	44

SOURCE: National Governors' Association Survey of State Welfare-to-Work Programs, 1989.

The JOBS program identifies two primary categories for participation in educational activities. First, custodial parents who are eighteen or nineteen years old and who have not completed high school or its equivalent are required to do so. Second, the states may also require individuals twenty years of age or more who lack a high school diploma or its equivalent to participate in an educational activity consistent with the individual's employment goals.

Although states are permitted to allow individuals to participate in postsecondary educational activities, they are not required to do so. An individual participating in a self-initiated program at a vocational or technical school, or at an institution of higher education, can satisfy the JOBS requirement as long as attendance is more than part-time and "satisfactory progress" is being made in an area consistent with the employment goals of the individual.

Virtually all of the states have an educational component within their welfare-to-work program. Table 8 presents participation levels and rates in educational activities for states that were able to disaggregate these numbers among basic remedial education, high school/GED, English as a Second Language (ESL), and postsecondary education. The most commonly reported components in state programs are basic remedial education and high school/GED instruction, often consisting of referrals to adult education programs. More than half of the states reported having ESL and postsecondary activities as well.

For the most part, participation in educational activities is low. In the nineteen states able to report this data the range of participation rates for each educational activity item is: 1 percent to 15 percent in basic remedial education; 3 percent to 62 percent in high school/GED instruction; 5 percent to 12 percent in ESL courses; and 1 percent to 15 percent in postsecondary education. Only a few states report providing

Table 8
Participation Levels and Rates in State Educational Program Components
(Fiscal 1988)*

State	*Basic Education*	*H.S./GED*	*ESL*	*Postsecondary*
Arizona	492**	-	-	398
	15%	-	12%	
Arkansas	15,951**	-	-	-
	15%	-	-	-
California	-	-	4,817	6,814
	15%	15%	5%	6%
Connecticut	61	730	868	446
	-	-	-	-
Georgia	772**	-	-	-
	21%	-	-	-
Hawaii	8	24	-	22
	2%	6%	-	6%
Kentucky	-	-	-	3
	-	-	-	1%
Massachusetts	1,000	2,900	1,900	5,700
	3%	8%	5%	15%
Michigan	1,451***	9,830***	-	-
	-	-	-	-
Missouri	-	30	-	777
	-		-	-
Nevada	40	95	1	-
	-	-	-	-
New York	-	-	-	1,039
	-	-	-	2%
Ohio	6,964**	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-
Oklahoma	83	616	-	2,425
	1%	3%	-	11%
Pennsylvania	430	1,536	254	-
	-	-	-	-
Rhode Island	200	700	300	400
	5%	18%	7%	10%
Tennessee	60	75	-	48
	3%	4%	-	3%
Virginia	-	11,019	-	-
	-	62%	-	-
Wisconsin	82***	-	-	64***
	-	-	-	-

NOTES: * Numbers given are annual unless noted otherwise.

** Combined basic education and high school/GED.

*** Monthly average.

SOURCE: National Governors' Association Survey of State Welfare-to-Work Programs, 1989.

educational services to a relatively large proportion of program participants. For example, Virginia provides educational services to 62 percent of their program participants and Massachusetts to 31 percent. States that supplement their welfare-to-work programs with substantial state dollars—California, Rhode Island, or Illinois, for example—appear to offer educational services to a relatively larger number of program participants.

Rhode Island has allocated an estimated $2 million for education and training for their "Pathways to Independence" program participants. Although a breakdown of these funds was not available, the fact that 1,600 of the total 4,200 program participants were involved in an educational activity demonstrates a strong state commitment to providing educational services. The same is true in Illinois, where the state allocated $26 million to "Project Chance" to supplement federal funds and more than 11,000 program participants per month were involved in an educational activity. In California's Greater Avenues for Independence (GAIN) program, more than one-fourth of the participants (27,582) in fiscal 1988 were enrolled in educational services and the state allocated close to $40 million to education providers.

Leveraging educational services and/or integrating the providers of such services into their welfare-to-work programs is a key first step for states in providing educational activities for their clients. The providers of educational services are fairly consistent across the states, regardless of the availability of state or other supplemental funding. The public school system's adult education program is the primary deliverer of educational services in most state welfare-to-work programs. The program is used to provide an array of educational services throughout state programs: basic remedial education, high school/GED instruction, ESL, and postsecondary education. The primary providers of educational services in state welfare-to-work programs are displayed in Table 9.

Learnfare. About one-fourth of the states (Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Illinois, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, Ohio, Oregon, and Wisconsin) reported that they are either operating, planning, or considering a Learnfare-type program requiring school attendance for AFDC youth for families to continue receiving full AFDC benefits. Learnfare programs and proposals vary considerably across the states, especially in the size of the efforts (i.e., number of participant slots) and the emphasis on sanctioning clients for noncompliance with program requirements. Three programs that illustrate these differences are the Learnfare programs in Wisconsin, St. Louis, Missouri, and Ohio.

Wisconsin's Learnfare program was the first established, and is probably the best known program of this type. This program requires all AFDC recipients, with some exceptions, who are either minor parents or between the ages of thirteen and nineteen to attend school, and then encourages them to complete their education. Once an individual becomes a participant in the program, they become subject to sanctioning. Sanctioning is applied if a participant accumulates more than two unexcused absences in a calendar month, as determined by the local school district. If this occurs, then the AFDC family loses that teen's share of the AFDC grant.

The Learnfare program in Wisconsin is a statewide effort that attempts to enroll and enforce the requirements of the program on all eligible AFDC recipients

Table 9
Primary Providers of Educational Activities in State Welfare-to-Work Programs[1] (Fiscal 1988)

	Basic Remedial	*H.S./GED*	*ELS*	*Postsecondary*	*Educational Activities*[2]
Local[3]	Florida, Michigan, Ohio, Oklahoma, Tennessee	Florida, Michigan, Montana, Ohio, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Virginia, South Carolina	Florida, Michigan		District of Columbia, New York
State DOE's	Vermont, California,[4] Connecticut,[4] Illinois[4]	Vermont, California,[4] Connecticut,[4] Illinois,[4] Rhode Island[4]	California,[4] Connecticut,[4] Illinois[4]		New Hampshire,[4] Arkansas, Missouri, New Mexico, South Carolina
JTPA Agencies	California, Maryland, Ohio,[5] Tennessee, Kentucky,[5] Washington[5]	California, Maryland, Ohio,[5] Tennessee, Virginia, Kentucky,[5] Washington[5]	California, District of Columbia,[5] Washington[5]	California, Kentucky, Maryland, Tennessee, Washington[5]	New Hampshire, Arizona,[5] North Dakota[5]
Community Colleges	California	California, Montana[6]	California	California, Connecticut[6]	
Universities	South Carolina			Hawaii, Massachusetts, Michigan, South Carolina	

NOTES:
1 Massachusetts and Hawaii reported providers other than those listed.
2 These states did not distinguish among the specific educational activities.
3 Includes states who reported provider as LEAS, local boards of education, local school districts, and public schools.
4 Reported as adult education.
5 State JTPA administrative agency same as State Employment Security Agency.
6 Reported as technical schools.

SOURCE: National Governors' Association Survey of State Welfare-to-Work Programs, 1989.

in the state. Data from November and December of 1988 indicates that a total of 4,412 sanctions were levied over this two-month period, 3,456 of which occurred in Milwaukee County. The program does have a provision for a fair hearing if the sanctioned participant wishes to appeal. Although only a small number of fair hearings have been held, the results have been decidedly in favor of the participant.

In contrast to Wisconsin's statewide effort with its more aggressive sanctioning practices, Missouri operates a Learnfare program in St. Louis on a smaller scale with less stringent sanctioning practices. The St. Louis Learnfare program, which as of June 1, 1989 had an active caseload of 497 individuals, is specifically designed to provide remedial education services to welfare recipients to prepare them for the welfare-to-work component of the program, which emphasizes training, job search, and job placement. The program administrators have established three priority groups for participation in the program. These groups are, in order of priority: 1) custodial parents under twenty-four years of age with no high school diploma; 2) long-term welfare recipients; and 3) welfare recipients who have not completed high school.

Sanctioning provisions have been the focus of much debate in Learnfare-type programs. The propriety and/or effectiveness of sanctions remains a divisive issue today. Sanctioning as described above is not uncommon in Wisconsin, while program administrators in St. Louis question its effectiveness and are more reluctant to sanction clients. Yet, though the frequency of sanctioning may vary, virtually all Learnfare programs have mandatory participation requirements and sanctioning provisions exist for those who do not meet these requirements.

Implemented in the fall of 1989, Ohio's Project Learn requires all AFDC minor parents to attend an educational activity with the state providing for the participant's child care and transportation needs. If the state cannot provide such support services, the individual is exempt from participating. In addition to support services, the program guarantees a summer job to participants through the JTPA program.

Unique to Project Learn is a system of combined incentives and sanctions. If a participant meets all of the attendance requirements of the program in a given month, the participant can receive a $62.00 bonus in her AFDC grant for that month. However, if the participant does not meet the attendance requirements or drops out of the program, then $62.00 will be deducted from her grant.

Given the variety of program designs and their relative newness, conclusive data is not yet available to indicate the impact of Learnfare-type programs. However, in St. Louis, Learnfare staff and Washington University are collaborating on an evaluative study of the program, with preliminary data due late this year. Studies of other programs are now in progress. Results of these studies will shed light on Learnfare and its potential value to state welfare-to-work programs. Until then, it is likely that states will continue to experiment with various program models in order to discover the most effective means to provide educational services to welfare recipients.

EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ACTIVITIES. The JOBS program requires states to offer a total of six employment and training activities: job skills training; job development; job placement; job readiness activities; plus two of the following - job search, on-the-job training, work supplementation, and community

work experience. Most of the adult AFDC recipients with children three years of age or more (or more than one at the state's option) may be required to participate in these activities as long as child care is available. Children under age sixteen or individuals attending elementary, secondary, vocational, or training school full-time are exempt from participation in the JOBS program.

Job Search. Job search has been one of the primary state strategies to increase employment among welfare recipients. All respondent states reported providing job search, in one form or another, as one of the welfare-to-work program activities. The term "job search" is used to describe a wide variety of activities. These activities range from a one-day workshop on job search skills and labor market orientation designed to teach and encourage people to look for a job, to job clubs that may involve structured job search activities over a period of several weeks. Because job search activities vary so greatly in intensity and duration, the cost of implementing such services also varies tremendously. Researchers have estimated job search costs for other employment programs at between $50 and $1,500 per participant.

Although job search has been one of the primary welfare-to-work program components, the participation rates in this component as a percentage of total program participants have varied among states. As shown in Table 6, six states reported participation rates in job search activities of 60 percent or above. Eight states reported participation rates between 20 percent and 59 percent and nine reported participation rates below 20 percent.

Twelve states reported the employment service agency as the main provider of job search assistance in both their regular WIN or WIN demonstration projects. In eight states welfare agency staff provide job search assistance. In Florida, Ohio, and Vermont job search activities are provided by JTPA organizations. Hawaii uses the community colleges for job search activities and Ohio uses vocational schools. In Tennessee, job search activities for welfare-to-work participants are provided by vocational schools and by JTPA organizations. Service providers by activity are discussed further in the Service Delivery Networks section of this report.

Job Skills Training. States reported the use of a wide range of job skills training. Thirty-three of the respondent states include a job skills training component in their welfare-to-work program. Among these states the participation rates for the job skills training component ranged from 1 percent to 26 percent. Four states (Delaware, Idaho, Massachusetts, and Michigan) reported participation rates above 20 percent.

Fifteen states use the JTPA system for provision of job skills training; JTPA is the main provider of this service. Other service providers include vocational schools, community colleges, and technical colleges. Three states reported that their welfare agency contracts directly with service providers, which may include community-based organizations.

On-the-Job Training and Work Supplementation/Grant Diversion. During fiscal 1988, on-the-job training was offered to welfare recipients in twenty-six of the respondent states. Under this option, participants are hired by an employer who receives a subsidy for the extraordinary training costs incurred as a result of hiring the individual. The reimbursement is usually based on a specified percentage of the employee's wages over a limited period of time.

In fifteen of these states, the main service providers are JTPA organizations. The other states contract directly with service providers. The percentage of program participants involved in on-the-job training range from 1 percent to 39 percent. In four states (Connecticut, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and South Carolina) more than 20 percent of the program participants take part in on-the-job training.

On-the-job training has been financed in a limited number of states through grant diversion. Fifteen NGA survey respondent states use grant diversion to pay for on-the-job training wage subsidies. Under grant diversion, all or part of a recipient's welfare benefits can be used to subsidize his or her wages in private employment. The participation rates in the grant diversion components tend to be very small. On average less than 1 percent of the welfare-to-work participants take part in grant diversion. In those states responding to the NGA survey, participation rates in grant diversion ranged from less than 1 percent to 4 percent.

Support Services. Child care must be provided to all JOBS program participants to the extent that it is deemed necessary for the individual to accept employment or remain employed, and for each individual participating in an educational or training activity in accordance with their employability plan. Child care can be provided directly by the states, through an arrangement with providers, by issuing cash or vouchers, through reimbursement procedures, or by other appropriate methods. States are required to pay at least the lesser of the actual cost of the care (unless it exceeds market rate) or the dollar amount of the AFDC child care disregard ($175/month for children over age two; $200/month for children under age two). Failure of the state to provide child care represents good cause for an individual not to participate.

Every state but one reported that their program provides or subsidizes child care assistance for individuals participating in a welfare-to-work program component. However, the variance among the states in terms of the number of families being assisted and the amount of state and federal funds allocated for this use is substantial (See Table 10). Obviously, some states have a greater commitment to providing child care assistance for program participants than others, and this accounts for some of the variance. It should be noted, however, that factors such as the size of a state's welfare-to-work participant population and the relative cost of child care in the state also accounts for some of the variance.

It is likely that states requiring participation for AFDC recipients with younger children, such as those with children age three or more as stipulated in JOBS (with a state option to go down to those with children age one or more), will be confronted with greater child care assistance needs. Presently, funding for this assistance is being provided by both federal and state dollars. As shown in Table 10, the most frequently used funding sources cited by states responding to the NGA survey are Title XX funds, WIN and WIN Demo funds, Title IV-A funds, and state appropriations. Most states rely on some combination of these resources to fund their child care assistance efforts. More than two-thirds of the respondent states provide extended child care after placement beyond that required under the AFDC program. Generally, this assistance is provided for a fixed period of time (for two, three, six, or twelve months). (See Table 11.)

Table 10
States Subsidizing Child Care Assistance for Welfare-to-Work Participants (Fiscal 1988)

State	*Number of Families Served*	*Total Funds $*	*Funding Sources*
Alabama	-	-	Title XX, WIN
Arizona	-	18,375,500	Title XX, State
California	9,561	59,024,000*	Title IV-C, IV-A, State
Connecticut	1,131	2,419,848	Federal, State
Delaware	752 children	1,472,988	Title XX, State
District of Columbia**	-	-	-
Florida	9,623 children	7,710,659*	Title XX, Federal, State
Georgia	649	-	-
Hawaii**	-	-	-
Idaho	318	22,036	CWEP, WIN
Illinois	-	5,135,800	State, Federal
Indiana**	-	-	-
Iowa	643 avg. monthly	1,444,021	Title IV-A, Federal, State
Kansas	-	3,364,251	Federal, State
Kentucky	1,429 avg. monthly	3,041,869	Title IV-A, Federal, State
Maryland	-	-	Title XX
Massachusetts	7,084* monthly	37,300,000	Title IV-A, State, Federal
Michigan	-	3,218,527	Title IV-A, State, Federal
Minnesota	2,937 per quarter	5,400,000	State, Federal
Missouri	67 in 7/88	62,433	State
Montana	-	396,851	WIN, Title IV-A
Nevada	280	105,470	Title XX, CWEP, State, WIN
New Hampshire	2,244 children	5,122,000	Federal, State
New Jersey	537	-	State, Federal
New Mexico	-	130,780	Title IV-C
New York**	-	-	-
Ohio	15,104	-	Title XX, State, WIN
Oregon	-	-	State
Pennsylvania**	-	-	-
Rhode Island	2,400	6,000,000	Title XX, State WIN Demo
South Carolina	-	-	State, Federal
South Dakota	834 children/month	607,248*	Title IV-A, WIN Demo
Vermont	830* monthly	1,541,000	Title IV-A, CWEP
Tennessee	-	-	WIN, Title XX
Virginia	-	-	Title XX, Fed., State, Local
Washington	-	-	WIN, CWEP, Federal, State
West Virginia	1,000*	84,000*	Title XX
Wisconsin**	-	-	-

*Estimates.

**State reported child care assistance but did not provide specific data.

NOTE: Information for this table was taken directly from the survey responses provided by the states. For some states, funds allotted per family served for the given year may not seem plausible. However, this type of computation is not necessarily valid because many families do not receive child care assistance for the full year, but rather for only a limited number of months during a given year. It should also be noted that state-by-state collection of data varies significantly as do states' means of providing for child care, thus making state-by-state comparisons difficult.

SOURCE: National Governors' Association Survey of State Welfare-to-Work Programs, 1989.

Table 11
States Providing Extended/Transitional Child Care to Recipients After Placement (Fiscal 1988)

State	*Length of Extension*
California	3 months
Connecticut	2 months
Florida	3 months
Georgia	12 months
Illinois	6 months
Iowa	12 months
Kansas	6 months
Massachusetts	12 months
Minnesota	until family income reaches 185% of official poverty level
Nevada	6 months
New Jersey	12 months
Rhode Island	until family income reaches 185% of official poverty level
Virginia	2 months
Washington	12 months after family income exceeds 135% of official poverty level
Wisconsin	12 months

SOURCE: National Governors' Association Survey of State Welfare-to-Work Programs, 1989.

In three states (Minnesota, Rhode Island, and Washington) length of time for extended child care is determined by income. In Minnesota and Rhode Island any individual (including nonwelfare recipients) whose family income is less than 185 percent of the official poverty line qualifies for child care assistance. In Washington, welfare-to-work program participants are eligible for twelve months child care assistance after their family income exceeds 135 percent of the official poverty line.

Table 12 indicates the states that reported providing transitional health care to welfare-to-work participants. More than one-third of the respondent states provide to participants extended or transitional Medicaid health care coverage, which is different from existing federal standards (four months for those leaving welfare because of increased income and nine months for those whose income disregard period has expired). Most states extend benefits for a maximum of twelve months, although three states extend benefits for up to fifteen months. In the District of Columbia, extended health care services are based on income.

Service Delivery Networks

Each state has created service delivery networks involving agencies outside the state welfare agency to provide services to welfare-to-work participants. Services offered to welfare-to-work program participants are provided by different agencies in different states. Table 13 presents the main service providers for on-the-job training, job search, educational activities, work supplementation/grant diversion, and community work experience.

Table 12
States Providing Extended Health Care Coverage to Program Participants
(Fiscal 1988)

State	*Maximum Extension Period*
Connecticut	*
District of Columbia	(income-based)
Hawaii	12 months
Illinois	15 months
Iowa	15 months
Kansas	12 months
Massachusetts	12 months
Nevada	12 months
New Hampshire	12 months
New Jersey	12 months
Ohio	12 months
Pennsylvania	*
Vermont	15 months
Washington	12 months
Wisconsin	12 months

*State reported extended health care but maximum extended period not reported.

SOURCE: National Governors' Association Survey of State Welfare-to-Work Programs, 1989.

As mentioned before, providers of educational services are fairly consistent across the states, regardless of the availability of state or other supplemental funding. The public school system's adult education program is the primary deliverer of educational services in most state welfare-to-work programs. Service providers of educational activities are shown in Table 9.

The role of the employment service has changed over the years as more states moved from the regular WIN program to WIN demonstration projects. In those states with regular WIN programs, WIN is still jointly administered by the state employment service agency and the state welfare agency. The role of the state employment service agency has varied in the WIN "demo" states; but a strong relationship between the employment service and the welfare agencies remains in two-thirds of the WIN Demo states. Although in most states the agreement between the welfare agency and the employment service is nonfinancial, some states, like South Carolina, have financial contractual agreements for job search services.

While all states reported some linkage between the welfare-to-work program and the Job Training Partnership Act system, there is considerable variation among states in the role and commitment of JTPA organizations to serve welfare-to-work participants. Coordination between welfare-to-work and JTPA programs occurs both at the state and local levels. Formal or informal nonfinancial agreements exist in all of the states for referral of welfare-to-work participants to JTPA programs. In those states with informal nonfinancial arrangements, welfare recipients are added to the JTPA pool of participants and no special services or priorities are given to them. In a few states the JTPA role is more substantial. In some states like Hawaii, Maryland,

Table 13
Main Service Providers by Type of Activity (Fiscal 1988)

	Type of Activity					
Providers	*OJT*	*Job Skills Training*	*Job Search*	*Educational Activities*	*Work Supplementation or Grant Diversion*	*Community/Work Experience*
JTPA	California, Florida, Georgia, Idaho,[1] Kentucky,[1] Missouri, Montana1, Ohio,[1] Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Vermont	Alaska, California, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Idaho,[1] Kentucky,[1] Maryland, Missouri, New Mexico,[1] Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee	Florida, Ohio,[1] Tennessee, Vermont[1]	Arizona, California, District of Columbia, Kentucky,[1] Maryland, North Dakota,[1] New Hampshire, Ohio,[1] Tennessee, Washington	Rhode Island, Vermont[1]	Vermont[1]
Employment Service	Washington[1]	District of Columbia,[1] North Dakota,[1] Washington[1]	Alaska, Connecticut, District of Columbia,[1] Washington,[1] Kansas, Massachusetts, Missouri, Montana,[1] North Dakota,[1] Rhode Island, South Carolina, Virginia, Washington		Virginia, Washington[1]	Alaska, District of Columbia,[1] Virginia
Welfare Agency	Florida, West Virginia	Arizona, Florida, Illinois, Massachusetts, New York, West Virginia	Arizona, California, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, New York, Oklahoma, South Carolina		California, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Rhode Island	Arkansas, California, Georgia, Iowa, Idaho, Michigan, North Dakota, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, South Carolina, South Dakota, West Virginia
Community Colleges		Hawaii	Hawaii	California, Connecticut, Hawaii, Massachusetts, Michigan, South Carolina		
Vocational/ Technical Schools		Arkansas, Georgia, Idaho, Montana, Oklahoma, South Carolina	Ohio, Tennessee	Montana		
Educational Agency[2]				Arizona, California, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Florida, Illinois, Michigan, Missouri, Montana, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, Oklahoma, Ohio, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, Vermont		

NOTES: 1 State JTPA administrative agency also the State Employment Security Agency.

2 Includes state and local agencies:

Connecticut, Illinois, and Oklahoma reported private employers/contractors as the main providers of work supplementation/grant diversion.

Illinois, Massachusetts and Oklahoma reported public and non-profit organizations as the main providers of community work experience.

SOURCE: National Governors' Association Survey of State Welfare-to-Work Programs, 1989.

Michigan, and Minnesota the state welfare agency enters into financial contracts directly with JTPA Service Delivery Areas for provision of services. The Maryland Department of Human Resources is planning to expand this role under the JOBS program to cover responsibility for program operations.

States are using JTPA Title II-A set-asides to promote services to welfare recipients. For instance, California is using the JTPA Title II-A 8 percent set-aside for coordination with educational agencies to fund educational services for their welfare-to-work program participants. Other NGA studies have shown that states have used their incentive policies for exceeding performance standards to induce local JTPA Service Delivery Areas to serve more welfare recipients. Some states provide special bonuses to those service delivery areas that serve welfare recipients above a predetermined percentage as related to the total number of JTPA participants.

In Virginia, the state-funded Reducing Dependency Through Training program offers service delivery areas, local social service agencies, and other service providers the opportunity to collaborate and use the strengths of both systems and the community to develop strategies for assisting welfare recipients in overcoming significant barriers to employment. The employment and training department (the state JTPA unit), in cooperation with the department of social services, issues request-for-proposals to implement the program. Service delivery areas and local social service agencies are eligible to jointly submit proposals. Emphasis is placed on the need to develop a coordinated systematic delivery of services that builds on the expertise of the community and the JTPA and social services systems.

Program Financing

There is a tremendous variation in how state welfare-to-work programs have been financed and in the reported funds available to cover program costs. Total reported program cost for fiscal 1988 varied from $517,276 in North Dakota to $207.4 million in California. Of course, some of this variation is due to differences in the size of the state and number of program participants. In addition, as the reported costs exclude costs incurred by nonwelfare agencies, some of the variation may be due to differences in the scope of responsibility assigned to such agencies. However, in general, states with stronger economies allocate more state funds relative to federal funds than states with weak economies. For example, during fiscal 1987 state funds for Connecticut's welfare-to-work program were four times the federal portion. Similarly, in Massachusetts the state portion was 3.75 times that of the federal government. Table 14 provides financial data for fiscal 1988 for those states that were able to supply the information as requested for their welfare-to-work programs operational at the time. This financial information only includes those funds allocated to the welfare agency for the welfare-to-work programs; costs of services provided to program participants and paid for by agencies other than the welfare agency are excluded.

Program Outcomes and Evaluation

Performance standards for the JOBS program must be developed by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services no later than October 1, 1993. The performance standards must be developed in consultation with the U.S. Department of Labor;

Table 14
Welfare-to-Work Program Funding Sources by State (Fiscal 1988)

State	*Total ($)*	*Federal ($)*	*State ($)*
Alaska	925,654	619,482	306,172
Arizona	1,831,900	1,473,900	358,000
Arkansas	3,444,713	2,165,274	1,279,439
California	207,400,000	76,500,000	130,900,000
Connecticut	15,180,325	2,836,469	12,343,856
Delaware	1,163,565	314,618	848,947
District of Columbia	2,566,578	1,318,785	1,247,793
Florida	15,822,479	8,243,595	7,578,884
Idaho	1,283,901	995,511	288,390
Illinois	45,000,000	18,120,000	26,880,000
Indiana	1,378,000	1,200,000	178,000
Iowa	3,496,104	3,635,337	3,130,767
Kentucky	636,876	578,979	57,897
Maryland	17,877,844	10,996,080	6,881,764
Massachusetts	77,500,000	16,300,000	61,200,000
Michigan	53,010,835	28,669,752	24,341,083
Missouri	1,506,215	447,750	1,058,465*
Montana	1,010,257	885,933	124,324
Nevada	535,899	397,554	138,345
New Hampshire	1,150,011	696,786	453,225
New Jersey	14,143,323	5,482,970	8,660,353
New Mexico	1,425,799	1,130,398	295,401
New York	56,900,000	32,000,000	24,900,000**
North Dakota	517,276	411,827	105,449
Oklahoma	3,665,347	1,931,933	1,733,414
Pennsylvania	22,832,750	15,194,600	7,638,150
Rhode Island	10,571,000	3,790,000	6,781,000
South Carolina	1,172,326	817,490	354,836
South Dakota	778,059	738,357	39,702
Tennessee	999,067	908,243	90,824
Vermont	2,475, 300	1,022,000	1,453,300
Virginia	9,071,664	5,631,047	3,440,617***
Washington	16,898,770	8,187,870	8,710,900
West Virginia	4,409,496	3,577,907	831,589
Wisconsin	10,262,118	7,135,884	3,126,234

NOTES: * Figure includes $540,000 from local sources.

** Figure includes $8,150,000 from local sources.

*** Figure includes $147,204 from local sources.

SOURCE: National Governors' Association Survey of State Welfare-to-Work Programs, 1989.

organizations representing Governors, state and local program administrators, educators, state job training coordinating councils, community-based organizations, and welfare recipients; and other interested persons. Recognizing the aforementioned data limitations, states were asked to provide information on those program outcomes used as performance indicators for their programs. Three-fourths of the states reported the use of welfare savings as a program performance measure. Twenty-eight states each reported using job placement and average wage at placement as measures of performance. Twenty-two of the respondent states use both job placement and average wage at placement. Only two states reported the use of educational gains achieved by participants as a program outcome to measure performance. Other outcome measures include: number of job placements in a year, thirty-day day employment retention, percentage of full-time placements, and average weekly wage. Table 15 presents a summary of the performance measures used by the states.

Nineteen states reported that a formal evaluation of the program has been conducted or is in process. Four of these states have only process evaluations while three states have impact evaluations only. The rest of the state evaluations include both process and impact measures. Only three evaluations are being conducted in-house by the welfare agency. The other evaluations are being conducted by private organizations such as universities or other private entities. The Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation (MDRC) and Abt Associates are the two organizations conducting most of the program evaluations. Other organizations conducting evaluations include the Urban Institute, Potomac Institute of Economic Research, Cornell University, and Washington University. Table 16 presents the type of evaluation and the organization conducting the evaluation for the nineteen states with formal evaluations completed or in process.

Table 15
Performance Measures by State (Fiscal 1988)

State	Percent Placed in Jobs	Average Wage at Placement	Welfare Savings	Educctional Gains	Other
Alabama	■		■		
Alaska		■	■		■
Arizona	■		■		
Arkansas			■		
California	■	■	■		
Connecticut	■	■	■		■
Delaware	■			■	■
Florida		■	■		■
Georgia	■	■	■		
Hawaii	■				
Idaho	■	■	■		
Illinois	■	■			
Indiana			■		
Iowa	■		■		■
Kansas	■	■	■		■
Kentucky	■	■	■		
Maryland		■			■
Massachusetts		■	■		■
Michigan	■	■	■		
Missouri	■	■	■		■
Montana		■	■		■
Nevada	■	■	■		
New Hampshire	■	■	■		
New Jersey	■				
New Mexico	■	■	■		
New York			■		
North Dakota	■	■	■		
Ohio	■	■	■		■
Oregon			■	■	■
Pennsylvania	■	■			■
Rhode Island	■	■			■
South Carolina	■	■	■		
South Dakota	■	■	■		
Tennessee	■	■	■		
Vermont	■	■			■
Virginia	■		■		■
Washington		■	■		■
West Virginia	■	■	■		
Wisconsin	■	■			

SOURCE: National Governors' Association Survey of State Welfare-to-Work Programs, 1989.

Table 16
Welfare-to-Work Program Evaluations by State (Fiscal 1988)

State	*Type of Evaluation*	*Organization Conducting Evaluation*
Arizona	Process	CADMUS Group
California	Process & Impact*	Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation (MDRC)
Connecticut	Process & Impact	Abt Associates
Florida	Process & Impact*	Inspector General
Maryland	Process & Impact	MDRC & Abt Associates
Massachusetts	Process & Impact	The Urban Institute
Michigan	Impact	In-House
Minnesota	Process	A State Agency
Missouri	Process & Impact*	Washington University
New Mexico	Process	Cornell University
New York	Process	Abt Associates
Ohio	Process & Impact	Potomac Institute of Economic Research
Oregon	Process	Private Contractor (ROSS)
South Carolina	Process & Impact*	Paradign, Inc.
Tennessee	Impact	In-House
Vermont	Impact*	Vermont Research Associates
Virginia	Process & Impact	MDRC
Washington	Process & Impact*	The Urban Institute
Wisconsin	Process & Impact	In-House

*Evaluation not completed as of spring 1989.

SOURCE: National Governors' Association Survey of State Welfare-to-Work Programs, 1989.

3. Conclusions and Recommendations

This study has concerned itself with state welfare-to-work programs, particularly with their education provisions. Results of the study provide practical information on the operational experience of state welfare-to-work programs and, at the national level, enhance both policy development and implementation activities. States in the planning stage and early implementation stages of their JOBS program may find the study results most helpful. The fifteen states (Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Georgia, Iowa, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Nevada, New Jersey, Ohio, Oklahoma, Rhode Island and Wisconsin) that started implementing the JOBS program in July 1, 1989 already had welfare-to-work programs in place. In twelve of the fifteen states, all services required under the JOBS program had already been offered before July 1, 1989, and in the other three states many of the services were provided. All fifteen states had allocated substantial amounts of state dollars to their welfare-to-work programs prior to July 1, 1989.

According to the Family Support Act, JOBS programs must include educational activities, job skills training, job readiness activities, and job development and placement. In addition, the state program must include two of the following four services: job search, on-the-job training, work supplementation, and community work experience or a state-designed work program. Approximately half of the respondent states provided all services required under the JOBS program during fiscal 1988. Twenty-four states had all of the four required services and twenty-nine met the requirement of two of four services. The participation rates in the different activities, however, have varied tremendously across states and within states across activities. For instance, while more than one-quarter of the participants received job search assistance in fourteen states, only six states had participation rates above 25 percent in job skills training. Further, only four states reported participation rates in on-the-job training of more than 25 percent.

Each state has created service delivery networks involving agencies other than the state welfare agency to provide services to welfare-to-work participants. Services offered to welfare-to-work program participants are provided by different agencies in different states. For instance, in twelve states job search activities are provided by the employment service and in four states these activities are provided by JTPA organizations. The JTPA system is the main provider of on-the-job training and job skills training; fifteen of the respondent states use JTPA organizations for provision of job skills training and on-the-job training.

There is also a tremendous variation in how state welfare-to-work programs have been financed. In ten states (California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Massachusetts, Missouri, New Jersey, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Washington), the

fiscal 1988 state portions for financing the welfare-to-work programs were more than the federal portions. In another ten states (the District of Columbia, Florida, Iowa, Maryland, Michigan, New Hampshire, New York, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, and Virginia), substantial amounts of state dollars relative to the federal portion were allocated to the welfare-to-work programs. In the rest of the respondent states, the state portion was substantially less than the federal portion. The financial data available suggest that some states will have to increase substantially the amount of state dollars allocated to the JOBS program in order to take advantage of full federal matching funds.

Educational data from those states that were able to provide the requested information suggest that most AFDC recipients are in need of educational services. For these states the percentage of the adult AFDC population that had not completed high school averaged 51 percent, ranging from 25 to 66 percent. Only two states were able to report the percentage of custodial parents under age twenty who did not have a high school diploma; they were 76 percent and 89 percent. Although a majority of the state welfare-to-work programs have an educational component, only in a small number of states are these services provided to more than one-third of the program participants. States planning their JOBS program will need to pay attention to the educational needs of the participants, the intensity and length of time needed for these services, and their effect on client flow. Implementation of California's Greater Avenues for Independence program (GAIN) has demonstrated that many AFDC recipients need long-term educational services before they can move into job training activities. Therefore, the participation rates in education activities has been higher and in job training activities much lower than expected.

Although thirteen states have established target groups for services, most state welfare-to-work programs have not targeted services on specific groups. Under the JOBS program, 55 percent of the resources must be expended on three target groups: families receiving AFDC assistance in thirty-six of the prior sixty months, custodial parents under age twenty-four who have not completed high school and are not enrolled in high school or GED preparation, and recipients whose youngest child is within two years of being ineligible for AFDC because of age. Although some of the reported state welfare-to-work priority groups are similar to the target groups under the JOBS program, they are not exactly the same. For instance, the term "long-term recipients" does not necessarily mean being on the AFDC rolls for thirty-six of the last sixty months. States will have to look carefully at the issue of targeting because under the JOBS program, full federal matching is dependent upon 55 percent of the funds being expended on the three target groups.

In many states, meeting JOBS participation quotas will require an increase in the number of participants. The JOBS participation requirement rates for 1990 and 1991 are 7 percent. Volunteers may be counted as participants in calculating the participation rates. Participation rates for 1992 and 1993 are 11 percent. By 1995 participation rates should reach 20 percent. Meeting participation quotas is more difficult than an analysis *a priori* would suggest. Studies conducted by the Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation show that although the vast majority of the AFDC recipients would attend a program orientation, less than half would show up for actual program services. In California, for example, 86 percent of those notified

of an orientation session actually attended while only 49 percent of those referred to services showed up. Other states have had similar experiences. In the past, states have defined participation in different ways; in some instances, those individuals attending a program orientation were considered program participants. Under the JOBS program, the definition of a participant is more restrictive and regulations preclude states from counting as program participants those individuals who are in the process of receiving program orientation or assessment and those assigned to job development and placement activities.

For the most part, state program participant tracking systems will need to be improved to meet information requirements under the JOBS program. A large number of state welfare agencies were not able to provide information regarding participation in different program components or the total amount of funds expended by program activity, though other state agencies had the information. This was particularly true for educational activities where the majority of the states were able to provide information on participation in educational services only on an aggregate basis. This study has documented that in many circumstances welfare-to-work data are incompatible across states and cannot be aggregated at the national level. This lack of participant information by state welfare agencies has implications for the JOBS program given its complex reporting requirements. When designing their JOBS programs, states should explore the possibilities and limitations of sharing information with other agencies regarding program participants, establishing interagency information exchange mechanisms, and determining the role this information exchange will play in the case management system. Because of the JOBS reporting requirements, many states will have to upgrade their management information systems. This endeavor takes time and resources. By consulting and sharing information with other agencies at an early stage in the planning process, the task of gathering data may be accomplished in a more efficient and less expensive way.

The inconsistencies across states on data items and the lack of uniform definitions and data gathering periods will also make it difficult to develop performance standards for the JOBS program by 1993. Performance standards for the JOBS program must be developed by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services no later than October 1, 1993. In order to be able to develop JOBS performance standards by 1993, states should be prepared to work cooperatively with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services to develop a national data collection system with common definitions. This study has documented several limitations in the data collection systems. These deficiencies need to be corrected early.

Another problem identified in the study is developing cost per participant figures that could be compared across states. This limitation is related to the decision of who provides and pays for the services. The total program cost is related to the types of services offered, to the existing service delivery networks, and to what kinds of agreements (financial or nonfinancial) exist between the welfare agency and the service providers. Because of the different existing arrangements among state agencies for provision and payment of services, a state-by-state comparison of welfare-to-work program costs per participant is not accurate. Depending on the type of arrangements among agencies, there is a possibility that the same intensity of services is being offered in two states with markedly different cost per participant rates. A

reliable state cost per participant comparison would need to capture the different arrangements within each state and among local agencies.

All states responding to the NGA survey reported having an assessment mechanism in place. Approximately 80 percent of these states assess program participants for literacy and basic skills. In addition, the majority of the states reported a two or more tiered assessment process where the initial assessment is conducted by the welfare agency and based on this assessment the individual is referred to other agencies or service providers for a more in-depth assessment. It is not clear, however, how these different assessment processes complement each other and how effective the assessment mechanisms are. Future research should examine the assessment processes and the validity and reliability of the tests used for the welfare population.

In summary, state efforts to promote economic self-sufficiency among welfare recipients have provided both the basis for welfare reform and a valuable lesson on program implementation. However, more will need to be done, particularly in meeting federal participation requirements and in improving data tracking systems for state and national monitoring and evaluation. Some states will require more changes than others and will benefit the most from training and technical assistance.

Appendix

Appendix
NGA Study of State Welfare-to-Work Programs State Respondents

1. Alabama
2. Alaska
3. Arizona
4. Arkansas
5. California
6. Connecticut
7. Delaware
8. District of Columbia
9. Florida
10. Georgia
11. Hawaii
12. Idaho
13. Illinois
14. Indiana
15. Iowa
16. Kansas
17. Kentucky
18. Louisiana
19. Maryland
20. Massachusetts
21. Michigan
22. Minnesota
23. Missouri
24. Nevada
25. New Hampshire
26. New Mexico
27. New York
28. New Jersey
29. North Dakota
30. Ohio
31. Oklahoma
32. Oregon
33. Pennsylvania
34. Rhode Island
35. South Carolina
36. South Dakota
37. Tennessee
38. Texas
39. Vermont
40. Virginia
41. Washington
42. West Virginia
43. Wisconsin